



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/819,033	08/31/2000	RICHARD A. BOOTH JR.		5666

7590 06/09/2004

RICHARD A. BOOTH, JR.
4372 NORTH WILDWOOD AVENUE
MILWAUKEE, WI 53211

EXAMINER

HANSEN, COLBY M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3682

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/819,033

Applicant(s)

BOOTH, RICHARD A.

Examiner

Colby Hansen

Art Unit

3682



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: applicant must include a reference to the status of the case being a continuation of parent application 09/235,192, now U.S. Patent 6,120,411, patented on September 19, 2000, on the first page/first line of the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tabor (US Pat. 3,858,674).

Tabor (US Pat. 3,858,674) discloses a wheeled vehicle (fig. 3) which includes a flywheel 9 for energy storage coupled to one shaft a continuously variable transmission (CVT) (fig. 4; col.4/ln.57) and with the other shaft coupled to at least one wheel 19,19' of the vehicle and incorporating control of the CVT speed ratio based on feedback of CVT output torque; wherein a fixed ratio transmission is coupled in series between the flywheel 9 and the continuously variable transmission (CVT), and of a fixed ratio such that the flywheel and CVT operate within the specified design speed ranged for the flywheel and CVT respectively; wherein a clutch 11,35 with corresponding clutch actuation means 12 is coupled between the flywheel, and the

Art Unit: 3682

continuously variable transmission (CVT) or between the CVT and the driven wheel(s) of said vehicle, said clutch actuation means controlled by either manual or automatic action to completely disengage said flywheel from said driven wheel(s) when said wheeled vehicle is either at rest or the desired speed is lower than the speed corresponding to the lowest CVT ratio; wherein a prime mover 31 is coupled to the flywheel and is controlled to increase the rotational speed of the flywheel up the maximum design rotational speed of said flywheel.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tabor (US Pat. 3,858,674) in view of Shigematsu et al. (US Pat. 4,715,258).

Tabor (US Pat. 3,858,674) discloses the claimed invention except for the explicit recitation of the use of output torque feedback as a means for adjusting the CVT.

Shigematsu et al. (US Pat. 4,715,258) discloses the background art of using the output torque feedback to adjust the CVT to be at optimum efficiency (col. 1/lines 13-61). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized the output torque feedback structure as explained in Shigematsu et al. (US Pat. 4,715,258) within Tabor (US Pat. 3,858,674) so as to create the necessary horsepower with a minimum of fuel consumption, as suggested by Shigematsu et al. (US Pat. 4,715,258).

Art Unit: 3682

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 4-7 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,120,411. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the attaching of the control methodology to a vehicle would be obvious (as disclosed in the specification of US Pat. 6,120,411).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/10/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the invention of Tabor does not use the same terminologies and that Tabor is mechanically more complicated than the applicant's invention. While Examiner agrees that the terminologies and mechanical structure of Tabor is not identical, it does fulfill the limitations set forth in claims 4-7, as broadly recited.

Art Unit: 3682

Applicant also argues the Tabor does not disclose using torque feedback as a mean to control the CVT. As broadly recited, the feedback of the output torque of Tabor is inherently a component of operation of the CVT; be it sensory feedback or mechanical feedback (while this may not be structurally the identically the same as applicant's invention it does read on the claim, as broadly recited).

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Submission of your response by facsimile transmission is encouraged. Group 3600's facsimile number is **(703) 305-3597**. Recognizing the fact that reducing cycle time in the processing and examination of patent applications will effectively increase a patent's term, it is to your benefit to submit responses by facsimile transmission whenever permissible. Such submission will place the response directly in our examining group's hands and will eliminate Post Office processing and delivery time as well as the PTO's mail room processing and delivery time. For a complete list of correspondence not permitted by facsimile transmission, see MPEP 502.01. In general, most responses and/or amendments not requiring a fee, as well as those requiring a fee but charging such fee to a deposit account, can be submitted by facsimile transmission. Responses requiring a fee which applicant is paying by check should not be submitting by facsimile transmission separately from the check.

Responses submitted by facsimile transmission should include a Certificate of Transmission (MPEP 512). The following is an example of the format the certification might take:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. (703) 872-9306) on _____

(Date)

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

(Signature)

If your response is submitted by facsimile transmission, you are hereby reminded that the original should be retained as evidence of authenticity (37 CFR 1.4 and MPEP 502.02). Please do not separately mail the original or another copy unless required by the Patent and Trademark Office. Submission of the original response or a follow-up copy of the response after your response has been transmitted by facsimile will only cause further unnecessary delays in the

Art Unit: 3682

processing of your application; duplicate responses where fees are charged to a deposit account may result in those fees being charged twice.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Colby Hansen whose telephone number is (703) 305-1036. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday and every other Friday from 7:30 PM to 5:00 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bucci, can be reached on (703) 308-3668. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.

Colby M. Hansen
Patent Examiner

 5/20/04


DAVID A. BUCCI 6/7/04
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600